REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-25 and 27-32 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending Claims is respectfully submitted.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Lin et al. and further in view of Blum et al. Applicant respectfully submits that Pallman in view of Lin et al. and further in view of Blum et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-14.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which is presented below in its entirety for the Examiner's convenience:

> 1. (currently amended) A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of:
>
> initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system;
>
> verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system;
>
> accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system;
>
> executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system;
>
> issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system;
>
> transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components;
>
> processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command using the server that is remote

from the local computer system; and
forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system. (emphasis added)

Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite additional limitations of the present claimed invention.

Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system" and "processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation using a server that is remote from the local computer system." The Pallman reference teaches that modular software may be utilized to acquire/retrieve source data, deliver data to a target, or to perform processing of source data (see Abstract and column 27, lines 33-54). However, the Pallman reference is silent a teaching or suggestion readable on the system of user verification that is a part of the Applicants method for controlling remote systems as is recited in Claim 1. More specifically, the Pallman reference does not show or suggest: (1) verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system and, (2) "processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation using a server that is remote from the local computer system."

In fact, nowhere in the Pallman reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman simply

does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claim 1.

Lin et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman that would overcome the shortcomings of Pallman noted above. More specifically, the cited combination of Lin et al. and Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system" and "processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation using a server that is remote from the local computer system." Lin et al. only discloses a dissimilar routing mechanism for networks with separate upstream and downstream traffic (see Abstract). The Lin et al. reference teaches that an access server is used to help authenticate users for providing dial up services to a client. These operations are included as a part of the process of setting up a communication session that involves a client (column 4, lines 45-50). It is important to note that these processes are very different from accessing a remote server for the purpose controlling a remote system over the Internet as is required to meet Claim 1.

More specifically, nowhere in the Lin et al. reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system as is set forth in the Applicants' claims. Consequently, Lin et al. simply does not teach or suggest the embodiment of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claim 1. Consequently, Pallman either alone or in combination with

Lin et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claim 1.

Blum et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman that would overcome the shortcomings of Pallman noted above. More specifically, the cited combination of Blum et al. and Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system" and "processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation using a server that is remote from the local computer system." Blum et al. only discloses a transparent proxy server that facilitates the establishment of data communications between devices (see Abstract). The Blum et al. reference teaches that a transparent proxy application listening on a predetermined port may receive requests in the native protocol of the request and may operate to establish the requested communication (column 3, lines 42-58). Moreover, Blum et al. discloses that it is known in the art that an "encapsulation routine" may encapsulate an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmit the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58 – 65). The server may then "strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode" (column 1, lines 58 – 67). By contrast, the Applicants' method as recited in Claim 1 requires that commands be transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components and be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' claims.

Moreover, nowhere in the Blum et al. reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system as is set forth in the Applicants' claims. Consequently, Blum et al. simply does not teach or suggest the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claim 1. Consequently, Pallman either alone or in combination with Blum et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al., either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claim 1 and as such, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 respectively overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. further in view of Bowman-Amuah. Bowman-Amuah only discloses a method for providing communication services over a computer network. Bowman-Amuah does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. that would remedy the deficiencies of the Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. references outlined in the response above. More specifically, nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system as is set forth in Applicants' Claim 1 (from which

Claim 10 depends). Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Pallman, Lin et al., Blum et al., and Bowman-Amuah references, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention as is set forth in Claim 10.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum and further in view of Sridhar et al. Sridhar et al. only discloses an enhanced network communication system where client and server communications systems are coupled over a data network. However, Sridhar et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum that would remedy the deficiencies of Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. outlined in the rejection response above. More specifically, nowhere in the Sridhar et al. reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system as is set forth in Applicants' Claims 1 (from which Claim 12 depends). Conequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. and Sridhar et al. references, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention as is recited in Claims 12.

Claims 15-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum et al. and further in view of Booth et al. Applicant respectfully submits that Pallman in view of Blum et al. and further in view of Booth et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 15-22 and 24.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 15 which is presented below in its entirety for the Examiner's convenience:

15. (previously presented) A server computer comprising:
an IP port which accepts FTP commands from a client computer system;
a processor coupled to the processor which executes the FTP commands;
a first memory coupled to the processor which contains a file system; and
a first memory coupled to the processor for storing an operating system, wherein the remote user issuing the FTP commands from the client computer can administer the file system, and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components.

Claims 16-22 and 24 depend from independent Claim 15 and recite additional limitations of the present claimed invention.

Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a server computer wherein a remote user issuing FTP commands from a client computer "can administer the file system, and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components" as set forth in Claim 15. The Pallman reference teaches that modular software may be utilized to acquire/retrieve source data, deliver data to a target, or to perform processing of source data (see Abstract and column 27, lines 33-54). However, the Pallman reference is silent a teaching or suggestion readable on the system of user verification that is a part of the Applicants method for controlling remote systems as is recited in Claim 15. More specifically, the Pallman reference does not show or suggest: (1) a remote user with access to a remote file system that (2) remotely administers the file system using FTP commands that are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components."

In fact, nowhere in the Pallman reference is it taught or suggested that a remote user with access to a remote file system that remotely administers the file system using FTP commands that are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components as is set forth in the Applicants' Claim 15. Consequently, Pallman simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claim 15.

Blum et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman that would overcome the shortcomings of Pallman noted above. More specifically, the cited combination of Blum et al. and Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a server computer wherein a remote user issuing FTP commands from a client computer "can administer the file system, and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components" as set forth in Claim 15. Blum et al. only discloses a transparent proxy server that facilitates the establishment of data communications between devices (see Abstract). The Blum et al. reference teaches that a transparent proxy application listening on a predetermined port may receive requests in the native protocol of the request and may operate to establish the requested communication (column 3, lines 42-58). Moreover, Blum et al. discloses that it is known in the art that an "encapsulation routine" may encapsulate an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmit the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58-65). The server may then "strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode" (column 1, lines 58-67). By contrast, the Applicants' method as recited in Claim 15 requires that commands be transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol

without File Transfer Protocol components.

Moreover, nowhere in the Blum et al. reference is it taught or suggested that a remote user with access to a remote file system that remotely administers the file system using FTP commands that are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components as is set forth in the Applicants' Claim 15. Consequently, Pallman either alone or in combination with Blum et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claim 15.

Booth does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman that would overcome the shortcomings of Blum and Pallman noted above. More specifically, Booth alone or in combination with Pallman and Blum does not anticipate or render obvious a server computer wherein a remote user issuing FTP commands from a client computer "can administer the file system, and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components" as set forth in Claim 15.

Booth discloses a dissimilar method and apparatus for compressing hypertext transfer protocol messages. The Examiner contends that Booth teaches a transmission system that employs a transmission of "Hypertext Transfer Protocol Without File Transfer Protocol" and that processes "the Hypertext Transfer Protocol into File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation...". By contrast, as discussed above, the transmissions executed as a part of the Blum system's operation involve an encapsulation of FTP commands using an "encapsulation

routine" that encapsulates an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmits the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58 – 65). As disclosed in Blum, the server may then "strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode" (column 1, lines 58 – 67). Therefore the imposition of a scheme such as is disclosed by Booth (where a Hypertext Transfer Protocol command is processed into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation) into the system of Blum that relies on the encapsulation and de-encapsulation of File transfer protocol commands would destroy an essential principle of operation of the Blum system, and thus would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Moreover, nowhere in the Booth reference is it taught or suggested that a remote user with access to a remote file system can remotely administer a file system using FTP commands that are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components as is set forth in the Applicants' Claim 15. Consequently, Booth either alone or in combination with Pallman and Blum et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum et al. and Booth either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claim 15 and as such, Claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 16-22 and 24 dependent on Claim 15, and that Claims 16-22 and 24 respectively overcome the Examiner's

basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Blum et al. and Booth and further in view of Bowman-Amuah. Bowman-Amuah only discloses a method for providing communication services over a computer network. Bowman-Amuah does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman, Blum et al. and or Booth that would remedy the deficiencies of Pallman, Blum et al. and Booth outlined in the responses to the above noted rejections. Nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah reference is it taught or suggested that a remote user with access to a remote file system can remotely administer a file system using FTP commands that are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components as is set forth in the Applicants' Claim 15 (from which Claim 23 depends). Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Pallman, Blum et al., Booth and Bowman-Amuah references, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention as is set forth in Claim 23.

Claims 25, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Lin et al., Blum et al. and further in view of Booth. Booth only discloses a method for providing communication services over a computer network. Booth does not teach or suggest a modification of Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. that would remedy the deficiencies of Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. that are outlined in the responses to the above noted rejections. Nowhere in the Booth reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system as is set forth in Applicants' Claims 1, 15 and 25 (from which Claims 10,

23 and 31 depend). Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. references, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 10, 23 and 31.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 10/24, 2005

Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060